DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 610 FL 022 295

AUTHOR	King, Kendall
TITLE	Acquisition Planning, Ethnic Discourse, and the Ecuadorian Nation-State.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	15p.; For complete volume in which this paper appears, see FL 022 292.
PUB TYPE	Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT	Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v10 n1 p33-46 Spr 1994
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indian Culture; *American Indian Languages; *American Indians; *Bilingual Education; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Federal Government; Foreign Countries; Indigenous Populations; Language Attitudes; *Language Planning; Political Influences; Politics of Education; Program Descriptions; Social Action; Spanish
IDENTIFIERS	*Ecuador

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the language planning efforts of the government of Ecuador and groups representing the indigenous peoples of the country. Government sanctioned policy and practice, as well as the grassroots efforts of the Indian population, both aim to influence language behavior and both have ultimately been directed at social and political goals. Government language planning until recently has sought to unify the diverse nation through Hispanicization and acculturation into the mainstream Spanish-based culture. During the last several decades, Indian organizations have sought to promote indigenous languages and the maintenance of Indian culture through bilingual and bicultural schools and programs controlled by the Indians themselves. Several of the education programs are examined. During the 1980s the government recognized bilingual education, largely due to the increasing political influence of Indian groups. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 372 610

Acquisition planning, ethnic discourse, and the Ecuadorian nation-state

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Cheryl Donnelly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Kendall King

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

Language planning in Ecuador is best understood as one aspect or component of a larger dialogue between the state and the Indian population.[1] Language planning from "above," referring to official, government sanctioned policy and practice, and language planning "from below" meaning grassroots efforts controlled by the Indian population, both aim to influence language behavior and both have ultimately been directed at social and political goals. The larger discussion is concerned with issues such as cultural autonomy, agrarian rights, and recognition of Ecuador as a pluricultural, multilingual nation. This paper will focus on what is perhaps the most immediate and widespread instance of language planning, acquisition planning, and reveal how it is a tool employed by dialogue participants to reach extra-linguistic aims; the changes in the national acquisition policy that have resulted from this process will also be outlined.

In the last thirty years, indigenous populations of the Americas have grown increasingly vocal in their dissent to the governmental policies which long threatened their cultural survival. Unlike previous social and political movements in the region, much of this dissent movement has been organized along ethnic lines.[2] This paper will examine the language planning effors, and in particular the acquisition planning efforts of the ethnically based political groups and the national government of Ecuador. As locally organized ethnic groups have grown in numbers and in strength, frequently implementing education programs designed to influence language behavior, traditional language planning perspectives appear increasingly unable to theoretically frame language planning efforts that originate from both "below" and "above."

This is largely due to two related trends which have remained intact throughout the development of the language planning field. Definitions and models of language planning have typically focused on the processes involved in solving communication problems, assuming that all members experience the problem and benefit from the solution. Closely related is the traditional view of language planning as the work of official committees and academies, as an activity carried out from the top-down (Cooper, 1989). Few have considered the efforts of those outside government agencies or other authoritative bodies, which has limited the field to describing, evaluating, and critiquing efforts implemented by such agencies. This perspective precludes consideration of language planning efforts which have occurred at the grass-roots level or those initiated

FL022295

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

by individuals (Cooper, 1989). It fails to account for language users as active participants, but rather views them as subjects of language planning measures. Given these two inclinations, it is not surprising that the field has run out of theoretical steam. Absent in the literature is an analytical framework which allows language planning to be understood as the conscious process and product of negotiation between groups.

The Nation-State and Ethnic Discourse

There is an inherent tension between the national government, which attempts to unify a diverse population and create a national community,[3] and ethnic minority groups which work to maintain themselves, assert their cultural "right" to existence. While rarely existing in diverse post-colonial societies, the conceptually ideal nation-state is that which is comprised of a group of people having a common origin, culture, and language, in which the "vertical authority structures are rooted in, and dependent upon the horizontal bonds of trust and identification among those persons who fall under its presumed jurisdiction" (Enloe, 1981:124). The degree to which the (vertical) state system is reflective of the (horizontal) national community and satisfies the (horizontal) population's needs, determines the success of the nation-state in its efforts to create a cohesive national community (Kelman, 1971).

Ecuador is of particular interest for this discussion because of its powerful indigenous organizations and large and numerous indigenous groups. There are,ten Indian nationalities, which comprise more than 30% of the population (Yanez Cossio & Tomoselli, 1990). Roughly 40% of the population speaks an Indian language; degrees of bilingualism vary.

The state's goals to modernize, develop, and maintain itself necessarily entail efforts to incorporate and acculturate ethnic minority groups–and regularly threatens their survival. This phenomena is apparent in Ecuador; its status as a multilingual, pluri-ethnic liberal democracy coupled with its efforts to modernize and develop along Western lines has lead to policies which often work at cross-purposes. For example, while the Borja administration conceded a large communal land grant to a group of Amazonian Indians, the administration simultaneously has taken aggressive measures to incorporate them into the national culture (Selverston, 1993).

While resistance to social incorporation and ethnic assimilation (and the economic policies which demand it) has always existed,[4] the power of the indigenous groups to vocalize dissent and participate in a dialogue with the government has increased considerably in the last 30 years [5]

Ethnic discourse "expresses the creation or reinforcement of group identity, among or between groups, where it establishes 'the vessel of meaning and emblem of contrast' as DeVos and Romanucci-Ros (1982:363-390) call it" (Diskin, 1991:157). Ethnic discourse is the establishment of group identity, recognition of group rights, and the subsequent movement towards realization of group goals; it allows for and results in continued social and political negotiation. The discourse incorporates varied strategic and tactical aspects and a variety of tools (Diskin, 1991). Language planning is one of the primary tools used in the ongoing ethnic negotiation between the Indian population and Ecuador's political leadership.

Language Planning and Acquisition Planning

Language planning efforts can serve as a group's tool for any number of tactical moves: defining ethnic boundaries, drawing attention to the size or power of a group, breaking traditional stereotypes, increasing internal cohesion, or challenging the status quo. Of particular interest in Ecuador are the Indian language planning efforts directed at bilingual education programs, which have touched all of these goals.

While there have been instances of efforts geared towards semi-linguistic and linguistic aims in Ecuador,[6] the bulk of language planning has been designed and implemented with extra-linguistic goals. The extra-linguistic aims in the case of Ecuador are directed at internal autonomy, cultural and agrarian rights, and ultimately full recognition of Ecuador as a multi-lingual, multi-ethnic nation. As Rabin's classification of language planning aims demonstrates, these extra-linguistic measures frequently involve instruction of a language to a large number of people, noting that "this kind of planning tends to shade off into educational planning" (1971:277).

Acquisition planning is generally concerned with the users and distribution of a language. Three acquisition planning goals can be distinguished: acquisition as a second language, re-acquisition of a language by populations for whom it was once either a vernacular or a language with a specialized function, or language maintenance (Cooper, 1989). The linguistic politics of Ecuador have centered around the maintenance or extinction of Indian languages (Chuquin, 1986); acquisition planning has been directed at their formal role (home v. school) and functional role (shift v. maintenance) in society [7]

Despite the fact that "bilingual education may well be one of the major examples of language planning today" (Fishman, 1979:11), acquisition planning is one of the least explored areas of language planning; focus has traditionally been more on the easily isolated status or corpus policy. Acquisition planning can, of course, be implemented from above and from below and like all language planning is "directed ultimately at

nonlinguistic ends" (Cooper, 1989:35). The remainder of the paper will outline the shape the discourse in Ecuador has taken in ideological and actual form. Government and indigenous acquisition policies and positions will be described. The results or compromises of the extended negotiation will also be reviewed.

Governmental Language Planning

Most governments, including Ecuador's, recognize the power of language to serve as "a(n) uniquely powerful instrument in unifying a diverse population and in involving individuals and subgroups in the national system" (Kelman, 1971:21). Until very recently the state's acquisition policy and implementation has remained relatively constant: shift away from indigenous languages and cultures to Spanish has been either an explicit or implicit goal. Carmen Chuquin, an applied linguist and Quichua Indian, summarizes: "under the ideology of national unification, education programs have been programs of *Hispanicization* and *acculturation*" (1986:3, emphasis hers). Similarly, in the words of one Shuar, the government's intent has been "through expansion...to acculturate, integrate, and finally assimilate indigenous groups and their cultures" (Puwáinchir Wajárai, 1989:295). The state and Hispanic elite of Ecuador, guided by the Western notion of a homogenous nation-state and development agendas, have encouraged and coerced integration of indigenous groups into the national culture and economy.

Until recently almost all formal schooling was conducted in Spanish; for most Ecuadorians, the school is an inherently Hispanic entity. This system has resulted in curricula which are irrelevant and instruction which is ineffective (Yanez Cossio, 1989). Many students are forced to repeat grades; drop out rates, not surprisingly, are high. The Meztizo teachers convey the attitudes of dominant society. Implicit in school education is the superiority of the urban, of the Spanish, of the Hispanic people and culture (Chuquin, 1986). As stated by a government official, "the state...has demonstrated itself to be incapable of respecting ethnic cultures and languages" (Abram, 1989:415). Prior to the 1960's; state policy has periodically mentioned the need for (transitional) bilingual education, but in practice little has changed. Generally state-run Ecuadorian schools have at best, ignored Indian languages and cultures, and at worst, actively repressed them (Chuquin, 1986).

Indigenous Language Planning

The Organizations

The origins of the now numerous and powerful organizations based on ethnicity date back to the early sixties, when development pressure in the Amazon became so intense that the cultural and economic survival of groups native to that region was threatened. In response, the Shuar, a group of about 45,000 who reside principally in the Amazon, organized local centers for political action. The *Federación Shuar* (Shuar Federation), a union of these local groups, was officially established in 1964 (Cotacachi, 1989; Puwáinchir Wajárai, 1989; Ruiz, 1989).

Self-determination within a recognized multicultural Ecuadorian state both was and remains the over-arching goal of the Shuar (Puwáinchir Wajárai, 1989). As is true for many indigenous groups, including the Shuar, access to land and agrarian rights are inextricably connected to cultural and linguistic survival. The Shuar work to preserve the economic and cultural independence through defending common agrarian interests, resolving historic land conflicts of the region, and asserting their political rights to self-determination and direct representation (Ruiz, 1989).

The Shuar inspired and served as an example for other groups. In 1978 the pan-Amazonian organization, *Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonia Ecuatoriana* (CONFENIAE), was formed to represent all groups of the region (of which the Shuar were the largest) (Ruiz, 1989). *Ecuador Runacunapac Riccharimui* (ECUARUNARI), a Quichua group, was established shortly thereafter. A multitude of other organizations developed, merged, and realigned in the following years. The current recognized representative of all Indian populations of Ecuador is the *Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de Ecuador* (CONAIE). Formed in 1986 and officially recognized by the government soon after, CONAIE represents the ten major indigenous nations.[8]

While specific demands vary from group to group, the issues pursued by Ecuadorian organizations generally parallel concerns of Indian peoples throughout Latin America. Central issues include (1) land and agrarian rights and concerns relating to subsoil and natural resources, (2) cultural and legal identity issues relating to educational and linguistic policies, and (3) questions of local and regional autonomy and self-determination (Stavenhagen, 1992).

Why is it that ethnic groups have become such powerful political forces in Ecuador recently? Conditions have been as difficult, if not worse in the past. The oil boom has kept the Ecuadorian economy afloat in recent decades, and the standard of

living is generally higher than in neighboring Andean countries. Yet while Indian organizations exist in other nations, they are not as numerous, nor as influential as Ecuador's. While rebellions such as the massive Indian revolt led by Túpac Amaru II in 1780-82 have occurred periodically, there was been little sustained, organized political mobilization based on ethnicity prior to the sixties.

Of primary importance in answering the "why now?" question is the growth of the indigenous elite and intelligentsia out of the school ranks. Due in part to Ecuador's relatively stable economic base and investment in formal education, certain indigenous groups, most notably the Otavalons of the Northern Highlands, have had access to formal education for decades. These schooled individuals have been instrumental in the formation of Indian controlled bilingual schools and cultural centers. Also important was the wide-spread disillusionment with development policies which were especially prominent in Ecuador in the seventies (Selverston, 1993). Another factor was the growing dissatisfaction with traditional parties to the right, which stress capitalist development and market integration, and to the left, which advocate class identification, both failing to address ethnicity. A final factor which continues to galvanize the Indian movements, although not mentioned by Stavenhagen, are the misleading or altogether unfulfilled promises frequently made by government authorities. For example, the Amazonian communal land grant mentioned above was written, despite promises to the contrary, so as not to allow the group any use of the resources of that territory (Selverston, 1993).

Language Planning and Educational Programs

Indian languages in Ecuador have an extremely limited functional allocation. Spanish is considered to be the language of the *buena gente* (decent people); indigenous languages are not used in most public domains.[9] The status of the indigenous languages, mirrors the status of its speakers. As Hornberger has pointed out, "language policy and language use reflect the socio-cultural and politico-economic divisions of a society; they can also be vehicles for challenging those divisions" (in press). The use of Indian languages in new domains by the Indian organizations is a vehicle and tool for challenging state policy in terms of the functional and formal role of languages.

One of the aims of the acquisition policy planning of Shuar and Quichua groups is self-determination and cultural autonomy. The programs that are designed, organized, and administered by Indians allow for greater control over their own children's education, but also permit them to assert themselves as capable and distinct groups. "The participation of the Indian movement in education in some aspects was an act of 'educating' all of the

population about the content and form of civil rights, and in particular, rights concerning culture and identity" (Moya, 1991: 8).

In 1972, the Shuar Federation initiated *Sistemas de Educación Radiofónica Bicultural Shuar* (SERBISH). Their objectives were to develop local cultures, encourage mutual assistance between groups, eradicate illiteracy, school the population between the ages of 6 and 15, and ensure the permanence of the communities in which the inhabitants live. A guiding principle was to make the school system reflect the "Shuar reality." With 31 radio school centers and 31 monitors, the Federation was able to reach 506 students in its first year. In 1977 SERBISH was officialized through Decreto Supremo 1160 and began operation at the secondary level (Puwáinchir Wajárai, 1989). In 1988 there were 4,519 students enrolled at 187 primary schools and 731 students at 39 secondary schools (Puwáinchir Wajárai, 1989).

The pedagogical theory of the program emphasized not mixing Shuar and Spanish, but using both for all topics. In the first cycle, the Shuar language was used to the exclusion of Spanish.[10] From the second cycle on, texts are written in both Shuar (on the right pages) and Spanish (on the left). In the third cycle, discussions were conducted in the language that the readings were not done in. This serves to create neologisms and pushes the topical domain boundaries of the language (Puwáinchir Wajárai, 1989).

The Shuar program is the oldest, largest, and the most well-known Indian controlled program; but others also exist.[11]. Inspired by the Shuar, and motivated by its own needs, Quichua in the providence of Bolivar formed their own schools in 1972 (Caiza, 1989). The organization that developed around these schools came to be known as *Fundacion Runacunapac Yachana Huasi* (FRYA). The objectives of the foundation are: (1) unity of the indigenous and Meztizo population, (2) recuperation of ancestral territory, (3) recuperation of cultural identity and traditional means of self-government, and (4) solidarity with other groups working for autonomous political autonomy. As of 1989 there were seventeen schools, thirty teachers, and more than 600 children involved with the program (Caiza, 1989).

These objectives carried over into the Quichua bilingual schools, which are designed to (1) educate the children to remain with family, community and organization, (2) teach primarily in Quichua with Spanish taught as a second language, (3) strengthen the organization, and (4) enrich cultural identity. Material and curriculum development is also a central concern of FRYA (1989).

Concerning the ultimate purpose of the schooling, the state and the Indian programs operate from fundamentally different positions. Critics of the traditional government schools maintain that they serve to reproduce the social and economic

structure, providing inadequate education which also devalues Indian life and encourages assimilation and integration (Cotacachi, 1989; Chuquin, 1984; Puwáinchir Wajárai, 1989). indigenous persons argue that they should be the only ones who teach their children and administer their schools (Cotacachi, 1989; Puwáinchir Wajárai, 1989). The state contends that the programs need to be regulated, and believes that the Indian population lacks the skills needed to run their own programs (Abram, 1989).[12] They maintain that if any state funds are used, the state should retain ultimate administrative authority.

The Indian population, through its organizations, has demonstrated that, in the words of one indigenous woman, "(we) no longer want to be the fruit of investigations and experiments, rather we want to be the actors and executors of a bilingual education that includes our historical reality, designed and controlled by us" (Cotacachi, 1989: 263). Seeking to incorporate marginal groups into the national culture and economy, from the Ecuadorian state's perspective, the Indian controlled programs are threatening and appear as demands for both internal and external autonomy.[13]

The academic impact and effectiveness of programs such as those run by the Shuar and FRYA is difficult to assess. However, the continued demand for these programs is a powerful (and reliable) indicator of their success within the communities. The social impact has been substantial inside the Indian community and in the national context. Many of the children that have participated in these initial programs have become the bilingual school teachers, Indian intelligentsia, and consciousness raisers of the present (Selverston, 1993; personal communication). The programs continue to be an important part of the creation of the present body of ethnically politicized Indians. The schools stand as continual reminders of the existence of Indian cultures and languages and also as testimony to Indian power to organize, teach, and administer their own programs (Moya, 1991). The schools have served as powerful tools for the Indian people; aside from the potential for real pedagogical improvement and linguist impact, the schools are rallying points for groups and have galvanized Indian movements to make demands outside the community.

Compromises, Concessions, and Change

The dialogue between the state and the nation has intensified over the last 30 years. The "political space" available to Indian organizations has grown and bargaining position of such groups has strengthened considerably (Selverston, 1993). As a result of the increasing pressure on the state, some significant policy changes have taken place at the national level.

The creation of *Dirección Nacional de Educación Indígena Intercultural Bilingüe* (DINEIIB) is one example of how official policy regarding indigenous languages' functional and formal roles have been altered. DINEIIB was officially established on November 9, 1988. Prior to the decision to create an agency specifically designed to administer bilingual education programs, related legislative measures had been passed. In 1982, Ministerial Accord No. 0005229 officialized bilingual, bicultural education in zones of primary Indian populations for first and middle schools, so that instruction would be in the Indian language(s) and Spanish. In 1983, the constitution was revised; included in the new version was a provision that in the Indian zones the principal language of education would be Quichua or the vernacular language, and Spanish would be used as the language of intercultural relations. However, little was done to implement these two measures. The lack of accord between official policy and educational and practice was repeatedly brought to public attention by CONAIE and other groups. DINEIIB was established, in part, as a compromise to CONAIE in 1989.

Moya (1988) has argued that the creation of DINEIIB was not a free choice made by the government out of concern for the indigenous population, but rather, it was the only viable political response. CONAIE, by the late 1980's carried enough political weight to alter national policy. She points out that it is significant that word Indian comes before bilingual or inter cultural in the agency's title.[14]

DINEIIB officials, on the other hand, claim that the bilingual education programs earlier in the decade demonstrated that Indian languages have the capacity to express technical and abstract concepts (Abram, 1991; Moya, 1991). State rhetoric around the creation of DINEIIB promotes bilingual educational as a necessary part of the national development plan and as an instrument to assist in the preservation of the cultural patrimony of the nation (Moya, 1991).

Codification of the decision to create the agency was concise. DINEIIB was established to guarantee the unity, quality, and efficiency of Indian education (DINEIIB, 1991). The elaboration of the decision, however, was lengthy and not entirely clear. A series of statements outline the state's general and specific plans to develop an educational system in agreement with social, cultural, linguistic, and economic reality, and in accordance with the needs and expectations of the Indian nationalities for the development of an intercultural Ecuador.[15]

One year after the creation of the agency an agreement of technical cooperation was signed between CONAIE and the Ministry of Education and Culture. CONAIE representatives were to be given positions within DINEIIB and were placed in charge of some aspects of the program, such as curricula development. Implementation was slow

initially, but by the 1990-91 school year, DINEIIB programs were in operation in 600 schools (DINEIIB, 1991). Content instruction in Quichua was available at first grade level. Plans were to increase the program by one grade level every year.

When DINEIIB was established, all bilingual education programs fell under its jurisdiction. The most notable of these is *Proyecto de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural* (PEBI). This experimental program, initiated in late 1984, is the result of a joint agreement between the Ecuador's Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) and the German Society for Technical Cooperation (GTZ). As of 1989, the project was active in eight provinces in the Sierra with seventy-five schools in the first and second grades and 135 participating teachers (Cotacachi, 1989). In these schools Quichua is used as the language of instruction and Spanish is taught as a second language. The program, according to PEBI officials, has been widely successful.

Both the rhetoric surrounding these programs and evaluations of them have been highly politicized and difficult to assess. Numerous critiques of PEBI have been delivered. Cotacachi (1989) cites PEBI's failure to (1) to sway higher administration to be true supporters of the project, (2) end the experimental phase of the program, (3) pass legislative measures to improve bilingual education, and (4) to win support for the program at the national level. While her claims are not entirely fair,[16] indigenous people have good reason to be skeptical of the government's capacity to administer a program which could reflect their interest and realities. It has also been reported that in the PEBI schools only some of the teachers are bilingual and many are unwilling to impart bilingual education (Moya, 1991). DINEIIB has also been subject to numerous criticisms. Not all DINEIIB schools have bilingual teachers, nor are all the indigenous teachers bilinguals, nor do they use bilingual educational materials or methods (Moya, 1991).

While there is likely to be an enormous amount of variability from school to school, and there are numerous and significant practical problems to be resolved, of importance here is the dramatic shift in policy. Recognition of the diversity of the nation-state is an important first step (as well as being CONAIE's top demand).[17] The Indian organizations can count the creation of an agency dedicated to Indian cultural maintenance and educational needs as a major success.

Conclusion

Language planning most frequently occurs in the midst of social change. The Ecuadorian case is no exception. As social, political, and economic forces converged and interacted in the sixties and seventies, ethnically based social movements became a national force in Ecuador. A social movement is a "sustained series of interactions

between power holders and persons successfully claiming to speak on behalf of a constituency lacking formal representation, in the course of which those persons make publicly visible demands for support for changes in the distribution or exercise of power, and back those demands with public demonstrations of support" (Tilly, 1984:306). As the "political discourses increasingly address indigenous peasants as national subjects," the most powerful social movements to have emerged in recent times have been those based on ethnicity (Crain, 1990:40). Ethnicity has defined the dialogue and at the same time been a powerful lever in the discourse.

Demands for access to public goods, which are based on ethnicity, hold a unique bargaining position. A land claim, for example, made by Huaorani Indians demanding their ancestral heritage differs considerably from that made by poor peasants seeking to better their economic position (Bernard, 1993). Similarly, on a more abstract level, demonstration for agrarian autonomy and land rights with 'bows and arrows' (or an Indian language) holds a "symbolic efficacy" absent from the demonstrations of rural peasants (Urban, 1993).

Language acts as an important tool in this exchange. Symbolically, language serves as a constant reminder of indigenous resistance to Hispanic rule and commitment to cultural maintenance. Practically, acquisition planning has been the means by which both the government and Indian groups have advanced their agendas. Language planning has been a tool in the ethnic discourse and political struggle over indigenous rights and the nature of the Ecuadorian nation-state.

Quichua language planners are teachers, educators, literacy activists, radio announcers, and all speakers who bring the language into previously untreaded communication fronts (Fauchois, 1988), and significant language planning occurs at the local and grass-roots level. These individuals are key players in the Ecuadorian language planning case. Important efforts such as these should be included in any language planning framework.[18]

---

[1] The usage of "Indian" originates, of course, with Columbus's great mistake. It has since been adapted to refer to all indigenous people of the Americas. While in the majority culture the sense of the term is generally derogatory, among indigenous peoples it has come to be a source of pride and unity among the many different nationalities. In this paper both "Indian" and "indigenous" will be used.

[2] While prior movements were founded on political liberalism, stressing voluntary association, or Marxism, oriented around class conflict and structural reform, the mobilization of groups in recent decades has been based on ethnic identification.

[3] See Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1983) for a discussion of this process.

[4] Chapters eight and nine of Spalding's *Huarochiri: An Andean Society Under Inca and Spanish Rule* provide an excellent review of Indian resistance (1974).

[5] The most recent and dramatic instance was the week-long Indian uprising of June, 1990.

[6] An example of a language planning measure with semi-linguistic aims is the restriction placed on domains in which Quichua is spoken (i.e. all government business is conducted in Spanish). The 1980 conference on the Quichua corpus is an example of planning with structural (linguistic) aims.

[7] Acquisition planning can address policy planning (language's formal role within society) and cultivation planning (language's functional role within society) (Hornberger, 1993).

[8] The organizations purposely refer to themselves as distinct Indian nationalities and nations, emphasizing their great historic past as well as the diversity of the indigenous population.

[9] As Abram (1989) has pointed out, not only is the concept of and possibility of using Indian languages in public domains absent from most discussions, it is unknown to most Ecuadorians.

[10] Rather than refer to hierarchical "grades," the levels are differentiated as "*ciclos*."

[11] The *Programa Alternativo de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural* (PAEBIC) of the *Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonia Ecuadoriana* (CONFENIAE), for example, has been in operation for decades (Ruiz, 1989).

[12] This is despite the fact that the Indian schools have been in operation for decades, and the considerable evidence that traditional schools have been less than successful.

[13] Internal autonomy demands include the rights to preserve a group's language and culture, control its schools and develop its land; external autonomy demands seek succession and altered geographic and demographic borders.

[14] *Dirección Nacional de Educacivn Indígena Intercultural* (National Directorate of Indigenous Intercultural Education).

[15] While DINEIIB policy papers appear promising, it should be noted that the government is notorious for making grand promises, which are frequently left unfulfilled. For example, the 800 million sucres promised to bilingual, bicultural education for 1989 and the 2,800 million sucres for 1990, never arrived (Selverston, 1993).

[16] For example, PEBI has published numerous books and pamphlets detailing the philosophy behind and the benefits of bilingual education. One organization certainly cannot be charged with responsibility for swaying the entire nation's opinion.

[17] According to the list of demands presented by CONAIE to the government during the 1990 uprising.

[18] A version of this paper was originally written for Nancy Hornberger's class (ED 927), Spring '93.

References

Abram, M. (1989). El papel de las organizaciones Indigenas n la educacion. In L. E. Lopez & R. Moya (Eds.), *Pueblos Indios, Estados, y Educacion* (pp. 411-424). Lima: PEBI & ERA.

Anderson, B. (1991). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. New York: Verson.

Bernard, R. (1993). Colloquium at National Center for Adult Literacy. Spring semester.

Caiza, J. (1989). Hacia un modelo de educacion bilingüe autogestionario. In L. E. Lopez & R. Moya (Eds.), *Pueblos Indios, Estados, y Educacion* (pp. 309-326). Lima: PEBI & ERA.

Chuquin, C. (1986). *La Politica Linguistica y Educacional en el Ecuador*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign.

Cooper, R. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yanez Cossio, L. Y. & L.E. Tomaselli (Eds.). (1990). *Educación bilingüe intercultural; una experiencie educativa* (2nd ed.). Quito: Abya-Yala.

Cotacachi, M. (1989). La educacion bilingüe en el Ecuador: Del control del estado al de las organizaciones indigenas. In L. E. Lopez & R. Moya (Eds.), *Pueblos Indios , Estados , y Educación* . Lima: PEBI & ERA.

Crain, M. (1981). The social constuction of national identity in highland Ecuador. *Anthropological Quarterly, 63* (1).

DINEIIB (1991). La educacion intercultural bilingüe en el Ecuador. *Pueblos Indígenas y Educación , 17*, 31-67.

DeVos, G. & L. Ramanucci-Ros (Eds.). (1982). *Ethnic identity: Cultural continuities and change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Diskin, M. (1991). Ethnic Discourse and the challenge to anthropology: the Nicaraguan case. In G. Urban & J. Sherzer, (Eds.), *Nation-States and Indians in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Enloe, C. (1981). The growth of the state and ethnic mobilization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4(2), 123-136.

Fauchois, A. (1988). *El Quichua Frente a la Communicación Moderna*. Quito: Abya-Yala.

Fishman, J. (1979). Bilingual education, language planning, and English. *English World Wide, 1* (1), 11-24.

Hornberger, N. (in press). Five vowels or three? Linguistics and politics in Quechua language planning in Peru. To appear in J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policy and language education: Critical Approaches.*

Hornberger, N. (1993). Integrative Language Planning Framework. Handout from Education 927, Spring semester. University of Pennsylvania.

Kelman, H. (1971). Language as an aide and barrier to involvement in the national system. In J. Rubin & B. Jurnudd (Eds.), *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations.* Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Moya, R. (1988). Educación bilingüe en el Ecuador: retos y alternativas. In L. E. Lopez (Ed.), *Pesquias en la lingüistica Andina* (pp. 367-386). Lima: Universidad Nacional de Altiplano.

Moya, R. (1991). Un decenio de educación bilingüe y participacion indígena: Ecuador. *Pueblos Indígenas y Educación , 17 ,* 8-29.

Puwáinchir Wajárai, M. (1989). La Federación de Centros Shuar y el problema educativo en la region Ecuatoriana. In L. E. Lopez & R. Moya (Eds.), *Pueblos Indios, Estados , y Educación* (pp. 289-308). Lima: PEBI & ERA.

Rabin, C. (1971). A tentative classification of language planning aims. In J. Rubin & B. Jurnudd (Eds.), *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Ruiz, L. (1989). Educación, formación politica, y autogestion en la Amazonia Ecuatoriana. In L. E. Lopez & R. Moya (Eds.), *Pueblos Indios, Estados, y Educación* (pp. 367-388). Lima: PEBI & ERA.

Selverston, M. (1993). The 1990 indigenous movement in Ecuador. Politicized ethnicity as social movement. *Papers on Latin America, 23.* New York: Columbia University.

Spalding, K. (1974). *Huarochirí: An Andean society under Inca and Spanish Rule.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Stavenhagen, R. (1992). Challenging the nation-state in Latin America. *Journal of World Affairs, 45*(2), 420-439.

Tilly, C. (1984). Social movements and national politics. In C. Bright & S. Harding (Eds.), *State Making and Social Movements.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Urban, G. (1993). Syboliic efficacy, metaculture, and nation-state. Talk delivered at the University of Pennsylvania, Department of Anthropology. March 2, 1993.

Yanez Cossi C. (1989). *La Educación Indígena en el Area Andina.* Quito: Abya-Yala.